

REMARKS

This reply timely responds to the Office Action mailed on July 23, 2003. Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 6 and 17 are independent claims. Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 11, 12, 14 and 15 contain allowable subject matter.

In view of the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,790,092 issued to Moriyama ("Moriyama") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,604,358 issued to Kim ("Kim"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 6 and 17 recites "a first distance between a first data line for a first pixel electrode of a first pixel group and a second pixel electrode of a second pixel group adjacent to the first pixel electrode is greater than a second distance between a second data line for the second pixel electrode and a third pixel electrode of the second pixel group adjoining the second data line".

In the Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Moriyama fails to disclose this claimed feature. Regarding this missing feature, the Examiner stated "Kim teaches a device of thin film liquid crystal display wherein ... a plurality of first data lines 13 are formed at right angle to the gate lines 12 discrete at parts crossing the gate lines 12, second data lines 14 are formed spaced a

certain distance to the first data lines 13 so as to be 1:1 matched with the first data lines, a plurality of third data lines 16 formed above the second data lines connecting between the second data lines (col. 3, lines 54-62, fig. 4)” (Office Action, pages 2-3).

However, the Examiner has not pointed out where in Kim discloses the claimed feature that is missing from Moriyama. The Examiner’s reasoning for the rejection fails to even remotely suggest a distance being greater than the other regardless of what the distances are.

It appears that the Examiner misunderstood the claimed features. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted “the distance between a first data line for a pixel electrode is greater than the distance between a second data line for the second pixel” (page 5, lines 6-8). This is not correct understanding of the claimed feature.

An example of the claimed feature is shown in FIG. 10 of the present application, in which “a first distance (d2) between a *first data line* (D4) for a first pixel electrode (- R) of a first pixel group and a *second pixel electrode* (+ B) of a second pixel group (+ R, + G, + B) adjacent to the first pixel electrode (- R) is *greater than* a second distance (d1) between a *second data line* (D2) for the second pixel electrode (+ G) and a *third pixel electrode* (+ R) of the second pixel group adjoining the second data line (D2)”.

In Kim, the first data line 13 is a source electrode connected to the pixel electrode 17, and the third data line 16 is in fact a drain electrode portion of a data line. In Kim, the third data line 16 is separately provided from and electrically connected to the second data line 14, which is a data line. The first, second and third data lines are all provided to each pixel region.

However, Kim does not disclose or even remotely suggest anything related to the claimed invention, including the claimed feature of the distant d1 being greater than the distant d2 in FIG. 10 of the present application.

As well known, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Thus, it is submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness on claims 1, 6 and 17.

For these reasons, it is submitted that claims 1, 6 and 17 are patentable over Moriyama and Kim. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 18 that are dependent from claims 1, 6 and 17 would be also patentable at least for the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10, 17 and 18.

In the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Moriyama in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,295,043 issued to U. S. Patent No. 6,295,043 issued to Hashimoto (“Hashimoto”), and further in view of Kim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 19-21 are dependent from independent claims 1, 6 and 17. As previously mentioned, claims 1, 6 and 17 are patentable from the combination of Moriyama and Kim. As previously mentioned, neither Moriyama nor Kim teaches the claimed feature of “a first distance between a first data line for a first pixel electrode of a first pixel group and a second pixel electrode of a second pixel group adjacent to the first pixel electrode is greater than a second distance between a second data line for the second pixel electrode and a third pixel electrode of the second pixel group adjoining the second data line”.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Hashimoto also does not disclose this claimed feature (Office Action, page 5, lines 7-9). Thus, none of the cited references discloses or suggest “a first distance between a first data line for a first pixel electrode of a first pixel group and a second pixel electrode of a second pixel group adjacent to the first pixel electrode is

greater than a second distance between a second data line for the second pixel electrode and a third pixel electrode of the second pixel group adjoining the second data line”.

Since one of the cited references, whether taken alone or in any combination, disclose or suggest all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 19-21 are patentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Maryam M. Ipakchi
Reg. No. 51,835

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: August 27, 2003

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/kbs

\\COM\210085.1